AF/2839

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Peter HUENIKEN et al. Application No.: 09/639,083 Filed: 16 August 2000 For: MULTIPLE AXIS CONNECTION SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Comparison of Comparison of

BOX AF

Assistant Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL FORM

- 1. Transmitted herewith is a Request for Reconsideration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in reply to the Office Action dated 2 August 2002.
- 2. Additional papers enclosed:

[]	Request for Approval of Drawing Change
ΪĪ	Drawings: [] Formal [] Informal (Correction)
ĪĪ	Information Disclosure Statement
Ϊĺ	Form PTO-1449, reference(s) included
Ϊĺ	Citations
Ϊĺ	Declaration of Biological Deposit
[]	Submission of "Sequence Listing," computer readable copy and/or amendment
	pertaining thereto for biotechnology invention containing nucleotide and/or amino
	acid sequence.

3. Extension of Time

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) apply.

- [X] Applicants believe that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.
- [] Applicants petition for an extension of time, the fees for which are set out in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a), for the total number of months checked below:

Total Months Requested	Fee for Extension	[Fee for Small Entity]	
[] one month	\$ 110.00	\$ 55.00	
[] two months	\$ 400.00	\$200.00	
[] three months	\$ 920.00	\$460.00	
[] four months	\$1,390.00	\$695.00	

Extension of time fee due with this request: \$_____.

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a Petition therefore.

[]	An extension for	months has already been secured and the fee paid
	therefore of \$	is deducted from the total fee due for the total months of
	extension now requested	

4. <u>Constructive Petition</u>

[X] EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

5. Fee Calculation (37 C.F.R. § 1.16)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED									
	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid	Present Extra	at Rate of	Total Fees			
Total Claims (37 C.F.R. § 1.16(c))	15	minus	20	0	x \$18 each=	+ \$ 0.00			
Independent Claims (37 C.F.R. § 1.16(b))	4	minus	4	0	x \$84 each=	+\$ 0.00			
[] First presentation of Multiple dependent claim(s) \$270.00									
SUB-TOTAL =									
Reduction by ½ for filing by a small entity									
TOTAL FEE =									

6. Fee Payment

- [X] No fee is to be paid at this time.
- [] The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$_____ to Deposit Account No. 50-0310.
- [X] The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, including fees due under 37 CFR §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310.

By:

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Date: 4 November 2002

William G. Battista, Jr.

Reg. No. 37,525

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel. 202.739.3000 Fax. 202.739.3001

Attorney Docket No. 051481-5053 THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE In re Application of Peter HUENIKEN et al. Group Art Unit: 2839 Application No.: 09/639,083 Examiner: Prasad, C. Filed: 16 August 2000 For: MULTIPLE AXIS CONNECTION SYSTEM

Box AF

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

In reply to the final Office Action dated 2 August 2002, the period for reply to which continues to run through November 2, 2002, please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully traverse the finality of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully point out that MPEP § 609(B)(1) states "[i]t would not be proper to make final a first Office Action...in an application after the filing of an RCE if the information submitted in an IDS during the time period set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(b) is used in the new ground of rejection. The Office Action makes a new rejection that relies on information (i.e., European Patent Application No. 415,489 (Mouissie)) submitted in the IDS under Section 1.97(b). The IDS was filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination such that the IDS was timely filed prior to the mailing date of the Office Action pursuant to Section 1.97(b). Thus, making "final" the Office Action is contrary to MPEP § 609(B)(1), and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action and entry of this reply into the record.

Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement in the next Office Action of the proposed drawing change appended to the response filed 11 February 2002. The Adivsory Action dated 22 February 2002, indicated that the response would be entered for purposes of Appeal and Applicants submitted a Notice of Appeal on 11 March 2002. Accordingly,